arXiv:1610.02590v2 [stat.ML] 25 Oct 2016

# Indirect Gaussian Graph Learning beyond Gaussianity

Yiyuan She, Shao Tang, and Qiaoya Zhang
Department of Statistics, Florida State University

**Abstract**

This paper studies how to capture dependency graph structures from real data which may not be multivariate Gaussian. Starting from marginal loss functions not necessarily derived from probability distributions, we use an additive over-parametrization with shrinkage to incorporate variable dependencies into the criterion. An iterative Gaussian graph learning algorithm is proposed with ease in implementation. Statistical analysis shows that with the error measured in terms of a proper Bregman divergence, the estimators have fast rate of convergence. Real-life examples in different settings are given to demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed methodology.

## 1 Introduction

Given multivariate observations for a number of random variables, learning dependency graph structures has widespread applications in machine learning, bioinformatics, and social studies. This gives rise to the undirected Gaussian Graphical Learning (GGL, for short), where the existence of an edge corresponds to a nonzero entry in the inverse covariance matrix. Much effort has been devoted to *sparse* inverse covariance estimation, where sparsity can be achieved by enforcing an $\ell_1$-norm penalty on the (off-diagonal) entries of the inverse covariance. Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2006) approach the problem by neighborhood selection. Their method results in an estimate that is not necessarily symmetric or positive-definite despite its speed from the simple design. Later methods mainly focus on solving the regularized GGL criterion using a variety of optimization techniques. See,

for example, Yuan and Lin (2007), Banerjee et al. (2008), Friedman et al. (2008), Witten et al. (2011), Mazumder and Hastie (2012), Oztoprak et al. (2012), Hsieh et al. (2013) among many others.

Despite the popularity and accessibility of GGL algorithms, the multivariate Gaussianity assumption is a rather stringent one, which becomes inappropriate when the data are fat-tailed, skewed, or discrete. Graph learning becomes far more challenging when the observed data are not Gaussian. There are a series of nonparametric papers that use copula transformations or data ranks (Liu et al., 2009, Dobra and Lenkoski, 2011, Liu et al., 2012, Xue and Zou, 2012). These studies do not cater to discrete data well.

Many parametric methods build upon Markov random fields (MRFs). The most popular and well-studied model for binary data is probably the Ising model (Ising, 1925). However, it is much more difficult to optimize the penalized likelihood compared to its Gaussian counterpart, because the so-called normalizing constant, which is a function of interaction coefficients, can be computationally intractable, and so people resort to various approximations. In light of Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2006), Ravikumar et al. (2010) turn to node-wise $\ell_1$-penalized logistic likelihoods, but the method shares the same pitfalls and requires post-processing. A group of pseudo (composite) likelihood based methods (Höfling and Tibshirani, 2009, Xue et al., 2012), developed upon Besag (1975), use the sum of conditional likelihoods in place of the genuine joint likelihood function.

Compared to binary data, Poisson data—prevalent in text, genomic sequencing, site-visit, and climate problems—has been a much harder category to model conditional dependency upon, thus enjoys less success. Combinatorial approaches (Madigan et al., 1995, Lauritzen, 1996) have been proposed, but they become easily intractable for even a moderate number of variables. Karlis (2003) models observed counts as partial sums of a series of Poisson random variables, and thus only positive correlations can be taken into account. On the contrary, Yang et al. (2012, 2015), also developed upon Besag (1975), can only capture negative conditional dependencies. To address the issues, some efforts have been taken to truncate large counts or alter the distribution function, see, e.g., Yang et al. (2013). These modifications seem ad-hoc and may fail to produce a joint likelihood with applicability. Recently, some studies have been performed to deal with mixed types of data, where not all variables follow the same type of distribution (Yang et al., 2014, Lee and Hastie, 2015).

There exist yet other works targeting on non-Gaussian graph learning.

In reality, these models, starting from a joint distribution or conditional likelihoods defined for a large number of variables, may not hold exactly, due to data imperfections (e.g., heavy tails and skewness). Even without such issues, we have seen that the Poisson MRF has severe limitations in modeling dependencies for count data. On the other hand, given each individual variable, practitioners often have a clear idea of what makes a proper discrepancy measure. Our launching point is the pre-specified *marginal loss functions*. It is worth noting that these losses may not belong to the exponential family or not even correspond to any likelihoods. So the crucial problem here is how to combine the given losses in a smart fashion, rather than figuring out a multivariate distribution for a large number of nodes.

Not so surprisingly, because learning the precise conditional dependence structure is challenging even for binary data or Poisson data, approximations have to be made. We indeed make simplifying assumptions and study an easier problem, which, in turn, gains **flexibility** and **implementation ease**. The proposed graph learning framework is able to accommodate various data types, and calls Gaussian graph learning iteratively to conquer non-quadratic losses.

In the rest of the paper, Section 2 describes in detail the indirect methodology of how to take associations into account, and argues its equivalence to the weighted fashion in GGL. Section 3 develops an iterative GGL algorithm and introduces a convenient trick to handle Poisson data. Section 4 performs some nonasymptotic studies. Section 5 demonstrates the performance of the proposed method with some real-life data examples.

# 2 Generalized Indirect Dependency Learning

Given an observation matrix $\boldsymbol{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ with $n$ observations of $m$ variables, and an estimate $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ of the same dimensions, under the independence assumption, it is natural to describe the overall discrepancy by

$$\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}; \boldsymbol{Y}) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} l_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k, \boldsymbol{y}_k), \tag{1}$$

where $l_k$ is a pre-specified loss for the $k$th variable. A special case is

$$\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}; \boldsymbol{Y}) = \sum_{i,k} l(\theta_{i,k}, y_{i,k}). \tag{2}$$

Such loss functions can be customized by users depending on the problem of interest. They are not necessarily identical in some applications. $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ represents the systematic component, e.g., $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{B}$, but may not be on the same scale of $\boldsymbol{Y}$. For example, in Generalized Linear Models (GLMs), $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = g(\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{Y}))$, where $g(\cdot)$ is a link function.

The $m$ random variables represented by the columns of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ are however often dependent and it could be very hard to build an MRF. (Recall that $l_k$ may not be associated with any distribution.) Without permission to modify any marginal loss, we aspire to incorporate dependencies into the criterion and learn a meaningful sparse association graph.

## 2.1 Additive over-parameterization with shrinkage

Let's motivate our framework in the multivariate Gaussian scenario. Assume $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{Y}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{M}), \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \otimes \boldsymbol{I})$, where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_{++}^m$—the set of all positive definite matrix of size $m \times m$, and $l(\theta, y) = (\theta - y)^2/2$. In this model, the rows of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ (samples) are independent while the column dependency is characterized by $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, or $\boldsymbol{W} := \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$. It is well known that $w_{ij} = 0$ in the inverse covariance matrix (or precision matrix) indicates that the $i^{th}$ and the $j^{th}$ variables are independent given all other variables.

Suppose the mean $\boldsymbol{M}$ is given or can be well estimated. In order to estimate $\boldsymbol{W}$, one can minimize

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{W} \in \mathcal{S}_{++}^m} \frac{1}{2} Tr\{(\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{M})\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{M})^T\} - \frac{n}{2} \log\det \boldsymbol{W} + P_W(\boldsymbol{W}; \lambda_W), \quad (3)$$

or the GGL criterion

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{W} \in \mathcal{S}_{++}^m} Tr\{\boldsymbol{S}\boldsymbol{W}\} - \log\det \boldsymbol{W} + 2P_W(\boldsymbol{W}; \lambda_W)/n, \quad (4)$$

where $\boldsymbol{S} = (\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{M})(\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{M})^T/n$, and $P_W$ is sparsity-inducing. $\boldsymbol{S}$ is the sample covariance when $\boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{1}\boldsymbol{1}^T\boldsymbol{Y}/n$. The $\ell_1$ penalty gives a popular choice for $P_W$, the resulting problem termed the graphical lasso (Friedman et al., 2008).

The quadratic loss in (3) utilizes a weighting scheme to capture associations. The technique applies more generally in MRFs with $w_{ij}$ denoting interaction coefficients. For an arbitrary loss one could write $l(\theta_{ij}, y_{ij}) = [l(\theta_{ij}, y_{ij})]^{1/2}[l(\theta_{ij}, y_{ij})]^{1/2}$ to mimic the quadratic form. But it does not have sound theoretical support, nor does it lead to simple computation. Instead,

we propose to modify the mean by adding a shift term $\boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}$ such that $\boldsymbol{M}$ is replaced by

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta} = \boldsymbol{M} + \boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}. \tag{5}$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ is an unknown component, and $\phi$ takes a small enough positive value such that $\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W}$ is positive semi-definite. Of course, the additive representation is over-complete. We append an $\ell_2$-type penalty $Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{C}^T\}/2$ to the loss, and define the additive over-parametrization with shrinkage (AOS) criterion in $\boldsymbol{W}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}$ jointly

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{0\preceq\boldsymbol{W}\preceq\phi^{-1}\boldsymbol{I},\boldsymbol{C}} \ & \frac{1}{2\phi}\|\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M}-\boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{2}Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{C}^T\} \\ & - \frac{n}{2}\log\det\boldsymbol{W} + P_W(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda_W).\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Interestingly, (6) is an equivalent formulation to (3). Lemma 2.1 shows a general result when jointly estimating $\boldsymbol{M}$ and $\boldsymbol{W}$. Let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{S}_{++}^m(\phi)\times\mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ with $\mathcal{S}_{++}^m(\phi) = \{\boldsymbol{W}\in\mathcal{S}_{++}^m : \boldsymbol{W}\preceq\boldsymbol{I}/\phi\}$.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let $\boldsymbol{Y}\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $\boldsymbol{C}\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $\boldsymbol{M}\in\mathcal{X}\subset\mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$. Suppose the solutions to problem* (8) *are (uniformly) bounded. Then, as long as $\phi$ is set small enough, the optimization problem*

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\boldsymbol{M}\in\mathcal{X},(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})\in\mathcal{Z}} \ & \frac{1}{2\phi}\|\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M}-\boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{2}Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{C}^T\} \\ & - \frac{n}{2}\log\det\boldsymbol{W} + P_M(\boldsymbol{M};\lambda_M) + P_W(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda_W)\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

*is equivalent to*

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\boldsymbol{M}\in\mathcal{X},\boldsymbol{W}\in\mathcal{S}_{++}^m} & \frac{1}{2}Tr\{(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})^T\} - \frac{n}{2}\log\det\boldsymbol{W} \\ & + P_M(\boldsymbol{M};\lambda_M) + P_W(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda_W).\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

From a Bayesian point of view, $\boldsymbol{C}$ can be viewed as random effects, with a proper right-design matrix $(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}$. But in general, integrating it out could be a formidable task even when $p$ is moderate. The equivalence of (7) to (8) is built by solving a ridge-type **optimization** problem; see the proof for detail. As opposed to the weighting mechanism, our indirect way

by introducing an auxiliary matrix enables characterization of dependencies without modifying the loss.

Back to the general case, we propose the following criterion

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{M}\in\mathcal{X},(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})\in\mathcal{Z}} \phi^{-1}\,\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M}+\boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2};\boldsymbol{Y}) + \frac{1}{2}Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{C}^T\} - \frac{n}{2}\log\det\boldsymbol{W} + P_M(\boldsymbol{M};\lambda_M) + P_W(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda_W). \tag{9}$$

The learning framework allows for customizing marginal losses (recall $\bar{l} = \sum l_k$), which is helpful in handling mixed types of data.

The mean term $\boldsymbol{M}$ varies in different scenarios: $\boldsymbol{M}$ is often $\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{B}$ in the presence of a design matrix, and when there are no predictors, $\boldsymbol{M} = \mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T$. In the rest of the paper, we always assume that $\boldsymbol{M}$ is known (or can be well estimated beforehand) unless otherwise stated, and focus on the estimation of $\boldsymbol{W}$, the problem referred to as the indirect Gaussian Graph Learning (**iGGL**). Experience shows that $\boldsymbol{W}$ provides a useful instrument for capturing some interesting association structures in practice.

In mixed graph learning where $l_k$ are not all the same, it might be helpful to perform a scale calibration. Concretely, under the assumption that $\boldsymbol{M} = \mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T$ with $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = [\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_m]^T$, $l_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) = l_k(\theta_{1,k}) + \cdots + l_k(\theta_{n,k})$, and $l_k''(\alpha_k)$ exist, we could scale $l_k(\cdot)$ by $l_k''(\alpha_k)$. The intuition comes from the following lemma (which can be easily adapted to show an asymptotic result), where $\boldsymbol{\Delta}(\boldsymbol{\Theta};\boldsymbol{M}) = [\boldsymbol{\delta}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{\delta}_m]$ with $\boldsymbol{\delta}_k = \nabla l_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) - \nabla l_k(\mathbf{1}\alpha_k) - l_k''(\alpha_k)(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \mathbf{1}\alpha_k)$, the remainder when expanding $\nabla\bar{l}$ to the second order.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Consider the problem of* $\min_{(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})\in\mathcal{Z}} \phi^{-1}\,\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M}+\boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2};\boldsymbol{Y}) + \frac{1}{2}Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{C}^T\} - (n/2)\log\det\boldsymbol{W}$. *Define*

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n(\boldsymbol{M},\boldsymbol{\Delta}) = \frac{(\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M})+\boldsymbol{\Delta})^T(\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M})+\boldsymbol{\Delta})}{n}. \tag{10}$$

*Then there exists a stationary point* $(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\hat{\boldsymbol{C}})$ *such that* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_n(\boldsymbol{M},\boldsymbol{\Delta}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}};\boldsymbol{M}))$ *can be represented in terms of* $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}$*:*

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n = [\boldsymbol{D}+\phi\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{D})]\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}^{-1}[\boldsymbol{D}+\phi\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{D})], \tag{11}$$

*where* $\boldsymbol{D} = \mathrm{diag}\{l_k''(\alpha_k)\}$. *In particular, if* $\boldsymbol{D} = d\boldsymbol{I}$,

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n = \hat{\boldsymbol{W}}^{-1}[d\boldsymbol{I}+(1-d)\phi\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}]^2. \tag{12}$$

Equations (11) and (12) provide some insight into inverse covariance recovery when only marginal losses $l_k$ of the joint model are available. It is easy to see that $-\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M})$ in (10) gives the noise component; in fact, in the GLM case of $\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}) = -\langle \boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}\rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{1}, b(\boldsymbol{\Theta})\rangle$ (cf. Section 2.2),

$$-\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M}) = \boldsymbol{Y} - b'(\boldsymbol{M}) = \boldsymbol{Y} - \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{Y}].$$

The higher-order remainder term $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ is zero for Gaussian (and can often be well controlled asymptotically under some regularity conditions on $l_k$). According to (12), when $(1-d)\phi = 0$ or $d = 1$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}$. On the other hand, as long as $\phi$ takes a sufficiently small value, $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}$ is approximately $\boldsymbol{D}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{D}$ from (11), i.e., $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n^{-1}$ up to some row/column scalings.

## 2.2 Examples of loss functions

The iGGL framework is universal since it does not limit to a specific loss. We give some examples to illustrate its applicability.

**Exponential family** Given a canonical GLM with link $g$, the (univariate) loss is given by $l(\theta, y) = -y\theta + b(\theta)$, where $b(\cdot)$ serves as the cumulant function and $b'(\cdot) = g^{-1}(\cdot)$. Then $\bar{l} = -\langle \boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}\rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{1}, b(\boldsymbol{\Theta})\rangle$, where $b$ is applied componentwise. Many distributions of interest in the family, e.g., Gaussian, Bernoulli, binomial and multinomial, have a cumulant function with bounded curvature: $b''(\cdot) \leq L$ for some constant $L$. This property greatly simplifies computation, as will be demonstrated in Section 3.1.

**Robust losses** Another important class of loss functions beyond Gaussianity take robustness as a major concern. Many popular alternatives to the quadratic loss are defined via a $\psi$-function: $l(\theta, y) = \int_0^{|\theta-y|} \psi(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$ (Huber and Ronchetti, 2009, Hampel et al., 2005). Huber's $\psi$ is given by

$$\psi(t) = \begin{cases} t, & |t| \leq c \\ c\,\mathrm{sign}(t), & |t| > c, \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

where $c = 1.345\sigma$ is recommended and $\sigma$ is some robust estimate of the standard deviation of errors. Tukey's bisquare is

$$\psi(t) = \begin{cases} t\big[1 - (\frac{t}{c})^2\big]^2, & |t| \leq c \\ 0, & |t| > c, \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

where $c = 4.685\sigma$ is recommended. Hampel's three-part $\psi$ is

$$\psi(t) = \begin{cases} t, & |t| \le a \\ a\,\mathrm{sign}(t) & a < |t| \le b \\ a\,\mathrm{sign}(t)\frac{c-|t|}{c-b} & b < |t| \le c \\ 0 & |\theta - y| > c. \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where $a/(c-b)$ is often at $1/2$. It is worth mentioning that both Tukey's and Hampel's $\psi$s are redescending, meaning that the associated loss functions are non-convex, which can be just as well accommodated by iGGL.

**Some classification losses** The Huberized hinge loss (Rosset and Zhu, 2007) can be used in support vector machines to reduce the misclassification error

$$l(\theta, y) = \begin{cases} 1 - c/2 - y\theta, & y\theta \le 1 - c \\ (1 - y\theta)^2/(2c), & 1 - c < y\theta \le 1 \\ 0, & y\theta > 1, \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

where $y = \pm 1$ and $c$ is a parameter often taking value 1. Another interesting Lorenz loss (Barbu et al., 2016) takes the form of

$$l(\theta, y) = \begin{cases} \log(1 + (y\theta - 1)^2), & y\theta \le 1 \\ 0, & y\theta > 1. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Lorenz loss is more resistant to mislabeled samples than (16). Clearly, these losses are not associated with distributions.

# 3 Iterative GGL for Computation

Before describing the algorithm design in thorough detail, it may help the reader to check the pseudocode of the iterative Gaussian graph learning (iGGL) in Algorithm 1. The key step (line 5) solves an ordinary GGL problem, after forming $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}$ on the basis of $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$. Nicely, we will see that in the Gaussian case, iGGL degenerates to GGL (and so converges in one iteration).

**Algorithm 1** The iterative GGL (iGGL) algorithm

**Input**: $\boldsymbol{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $\lambda_W$, $\nabla\bar{l}$ satisfying Lip-1; $\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[0]} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ (e.g., $\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[0]} = \boldsymbol{Y}$), $\boldsymbol{W}^{[0]} \in \mathcal{S}^m_{++}$ (e.g., diag$\{1/var(\boldsymbol{y}_k)\}$), $\phi$ small enough (say $c/\|\boldsymbol{W}^{[0]}\|_2$ with $c$ =1e-3)

1: $\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[0]} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[0]} + \phi(\boldsymbol{M} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[0]})\boldsymbol{W}^{[0]}$;
2: **while** not converged **do**
3: $k \leftarrow k + 1$;
4: $\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k]} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k-1]} - \nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k-1]})$, $\boldsymbol{S}^{[k]} = (\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k]} - \boldsymbol{M})^T(\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k]} - \boldsymbol{M})/n$;
5: $\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]} \leftarrow \text{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{W}\in\mathcal{S}^m_{++}} - \log\det(\boldsymbol{W}) + Tr\{\boldsymbol{S}^{[k]}\boldsymbol{W}\} + 2P(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda)/n$;
6: $\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k]} + \phi(\boldsymbol{M} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k]})\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]}$;
7: **end while**
8: **return** $\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]}$.

## 3.1 Linearization through $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$

For simplicity, we assume that the gradient of each loss function is Lipschitz continuous:

$$\|\nabla l_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - \nabla l_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2)\|_2 \le L\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_2\|_2, \quad \forall\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \tag{18}$$

where $L$ is a constant. Recall the optimization problem with $\boldsymbol{M}$ given

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})\in\mathcal{Z}} F :=& \phi^{-1}\,\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M} + \boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}; \boldsymbol{Y}) + \frac{1}{2}Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{C}^T\} \\ & - \frac{n}{2}\log\det\boldsymbol{W} + P(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda),\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where $\phi$ is sufficiently small assumed throughout the section, and $\bar{l} = \sum l_k$ as in (1).

It might look straightforward to apply BCD to solve for $\boldsymbol{W}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}$ alternatively. We take a different route to convert to the problem to GGL based on Lemma 2.1, where the key is to linearize the first term in (19) through $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = \boldsymbol{M} + \boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}$. Given the $k$th iterate $(\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]}, \boldsymbol{C}^{[k]})$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]} = \boldsymbol{M} + \boldsymbol{C}^{[k]}(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]})^{1/2}$, construct a surrogate function

$$\begin{aligned}g(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C};\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]},\boldsymbol{C}^{[k]}) &= \phi^{-1}\,\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]};\boldsymbol{Y}) + \phi^{-1}\langle\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]}), \boldsymbol{\Theta} - \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]}\rangle \\ &+ \frac{\rho}{2\phi}\|\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]}\|\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{2}Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{C}^T\} - \frac{n}{2}\log\det\boldsymbol{W} + P(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda),\end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\bar{l}$ is the gradient of $\bar{l}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$. In the univariate case of (2), $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta};\boldsymbol{Y}) = [l'(\theta_{ij};y_{ij})]$. Now define the $(k+1)^{th}$ iterate as

$$(\boldsymbol{W}^{[k+1]},\boldsymbol{C}^{[k+1]}) = \underset{(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})\in\mathcal{Z}}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, g(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C};\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]},\boldsymbol{C}^{[k]}). \tag{20}$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *Assume the Lipschitz-gradient condition* (18)*. Then, as long as $\rho \geq L$, the sequence of iterates defined by* (20) *satisfies*

$$F(\boldsymbol{W}^{[k+1]},\boldsymbol{C}^{[k+1]}) \leq F(\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]},\boldsymbol{C}^{[k]}).$$

*That is, the objective function values are non-increasing during the iteration.*

See Appendix C for its proof which holds as long as $\nabla\bar{l}$ is Lipschitz. The problem boils down to the $g$-optimization in (20), which is way simpler than direct minimizing $F$. We write the problem in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})\in\mathcal{Z}}\ & \frac{\rho}{2\phi}\|\boldsymbol{M}+\boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}-\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k+1]}\|_F^2+\frac{1}{2}Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{C}^T\}\\ & -\frac{n}{2}\log\det(\boldsymbol{W})+P(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda),\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k+1]} = \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]} - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]})/\rho \tag{22}$$

and $1/\rho$ amounts to the step size.

The problem can be further simplified—under condition (18), we can scale each loss function by $L$ beforehand and set $\rho = 1$. (The problem is much harder for $\rho > 1$.) For example, the Bernoulli deviance $l$ satisfies $L = 1/4$, and we can use $4l$ as the input loss function. Of course, when $L \leq 1$, one does not have to perform the scaling to take $\rho = 1$, but this will result in some sacrifice in convergence speed. The quadratic loss has $L = 1$, and the Lorentz loss satisfies $L = 2$.

While the Lipschitz continuity on the gradient is desirable to achieve a universal step size, it is not absolutely necessary in implementation. One could apply some line search method to get proper stepsizes to guarantee non-increasing objective function values.

## 3.2 $\boldsymbol{W}$-optimization

It remains to solve (21) with $\rho = 1$. Nicely, applying Lemma 2.1 again (or plugging in $\boldsymbol{C} = (\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k+1]} - \boldsymbol{M})(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}$), we are back to the GGL problem in computation

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{W} \in \mathcal{S}_{++}^m} \frac{n}{2} Tr\{\boldsymbol{S}^{[k+1]}\boldsymbol{W}\} - \frac{n}{2} \log\det(\boldsymbol{W}) + P(\boldsymbol{W}; \lambda), \tag{23}$$

where $\boldsymbol{S}^{[k+1]} = (\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k+1]} - \boldsymbol{M})^T(\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k+1]} - \boldsymbol{M})/n$.

There is a rich collection of GGL algorithms. The $\ell_1$-penalized form of (23) gives the convex graphical lasso problem. Friedman et al. (2008) partition the inverse covariance matrix and estimate its corresponding sparse rows/columns in a block-wise fashion. There are also some fast second-order methods, see, e.g., Hsieh et al. (2013), Oztoprak et al. (2012) and Treister and Turek (2014). All these algorithms can be seamlessly applied here to solve the $\ell_1$-penalized $\boldsymbol{W}$-optimization problem. We use a projected scaled sub-gradient algorithm due to Schmidt (2010) (the Gafni-Bertsekas variant) which is developed on the orthant-wise quasi-Newton method in Andrew and Gao (2007).

The complete procedure of estimating the association structure is presented in Algorithm 1. Note that the auxiliary matrix $\boldsymbol{C}$ does not have to be explicitly computed, and forming the matrices $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}$ does not need SVD or matrix square-root operations. This is because the key quantity $\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]}$ can be written as a (weighted) average of $\boldsymbol{M}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k]}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]} &= \boldsymbol{M} + \boldsymbol{C}^{[k]}(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]})^{1/2} \\
&= \boldsymbol{M} + (\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k]} - \boldsymbol{M})(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]})^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]})^{1/2} \\
&= \boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]}\phi + \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k]}(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]}).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, with $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$, $\boldsymbol{W}$, $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ available, evaluating the objective function value does not need $\boldsymbol{C}$, either. This is because $Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{C}^T\} = Tr\{(\boldsymbol{\Xi} - \boldsymbol{M})(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{\Xi} - \boldsymbol{M})^T\}$.

When $l(\theta, y) = (\theta - y)^2/2$, $\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{[k]}$ in Step 4 is always $\boldsymbol{Y}$, indicating no need to iterate. Otherwise GGL is performed iteratively. The key component of Algorithm 1 relies on GGL that is well studied. This provides great implementation ease, compared to designing a separate algorithm for each problem with a different loss, and has convergence guarantee according to Lemma 3.1.

Experience shows that $\phi$ is not a sensitive parameter as long as it is small enough. (A further idea is to use varying $\phi^{[k]}$, say, $\phi^{[k]} = c/\|\boldsymbol{W}^{[k]}\|_2$ with $c$ a small number less than 1. Although it shows excellent performance in applications, we will investigate it in future work.) When $\boldsymbol{M}$ is unknown, e.g., $\boldsymbol{M} = \mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T$ with $m$ intercepts, the linearization still carries over and one can use BCD to solve for $\boldsymbol{M}$ and $\boldsymbol{W}$ alternatively in the $g$-optimization step.

### 3.3 A Poisson re-parameterization

This subsection concentrates on the Poisson case, i.e. $l(\theta, y) = -y\theta + \exp(\theta)$. Since the loss does not have bounded curvature, there is a lack of universal stepsize. In principle, this issue could be remedied with line search but our experiments show that it is not very efficient.

We make an additional assumption that $\boldsymbol{M}$ contains intercepts, and write $\boldsymbol{M} = \mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T + \boldsymbol{M}^\circ$. This is a mild assumption in many applications, since the a Poisson random variable cannot be centered without changing its distribution. It follows that

$$\boldsymbol{\Theta} = \mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T + \boldsymbol{M}^\circ + \boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2} \equiv \mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T + \boldsymbol{\Theta}^\circ, \tag{24}$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is a column vector of $n$ ones and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ represents the intercepts. Plugging it into the loss, we get $\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}^\circ) = \sum_{k=1}^m -\langle \boldsymbol{y}_k, \mathbf{1}\alpha_k + \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ\rangle + \langle \mathbf{1}, \exp(\mathbf{1}\alpha_k + \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)\rangle$. Let $\boldsymbol{a} = [a_1, \cdots a_m]^T$ such that $a_k = \alpha_k + \log\langle \mathbf{1}, \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)\rangle$, and $\exp(a_k) = \langle \mathbf{1}, \exp(\mathbf{1}\alpha_k + \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)\rangle$ with $\exp(\cdot)$ defined componentwise. Then

$$\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}^\circ) = \sum_{k=1}^m \left[-\langle \boldsymbol{y}_k, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ\rangle + \langle \boldsymbol{y}_k, \mathbf{1}\rangle \log\langle \mathbf{1}, \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)\rangle\right] + \left[-\langle \boldsymbol{y}_k, \mathbf{1}\rangle a_k + \exp(a_k)\right],$$

which is separable in $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}^\circ$. If there is no further penalty imposed on $\boldsymbol{a}$, $\boldsymbol{a}^{opt} = \log(\boldsymbol{Y}^T\mathbf{1})$. The loss on $\boldsymbol{\Theta}^\circ$ writes

$$\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^\circ) = \sum_{k=1}^m l_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ) = \sum_{k=1}^m -\langle \boldsymbol{y}_k, \boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ\rangle + c_k \log\langle \mathbf{1}, \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)\rangle, \tag{25}$$

where $c_k = \langle \boldsymbol{y}_k, \mathbf{1}\rangle$. It is easy to see that the gradient of $l_k$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ$ is $-\boldsymbol{y}_k + c_k \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)/\langle 1, \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)\rangle$, and so the associated Hessian satisfies

$$\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) = c_k \left\{ \mathrm{diag}\left[\frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)}{\langle \mathbf{1}, \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)\rangle}\right] - \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)[\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)]^T}{\langle \mathbf{1}, \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k^\circ)\rangle^2} \right\} \preceq \frac{c_k}{2}\boldsymbol{I}. \tag{26}$$

To secure the desirable properties associated with $\rho = 1$, one can scale $l_k$ by $c_k/2$ or use the overall Lipschitz constant $L = \max_{1\le k\le m}\langle \boldsymbol{y}_k, \mathbf{1}\rangle = \|\boldsymbol{Y}\|_1/2$.

# 4 Statistical Algorithmic Analysis

In this section, we assume that $\boldsymbol{M}$ is known and (18) is satisfied with $L = 1$. The overall objective in (19) is denoted by $F$ and the penalty $P$ takes the form of $P(\boldsymbol{W}) = (n/2)\lambda\|\boldsymbol{W}\|_1$. Because of the nonconvex nature of the problem, studying the performance of the set of global minimizers may not provide enough guidance in practice. We will investigate the statistical accuracy of the set of *fixed points* under the iGGL algorithm mapping (cf. (20) with $\rho = 1$):

$$\mathcal{F} = \Big\{(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{C}}) \in \mathcal{Z} : (\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{C}}) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})\in\mathcal{Z}} g(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}; \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-)\big|_{\boldsymbol{W}^-=\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\boldsymbol{C}^-=\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}}\Big\}. \tag{27}$$

The problem in (27) has a unique minimizer. In fact, given any feasible $\boldsymbol{W}$, $g$ is strongly convex in $\boldsymbol{C}$. Define

$$\boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}; \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{C}} g(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}; \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-).$$

Then $g(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}; \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-); \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-)$ is strictly convex in $\boldsymbol{W}$.

First, we need to define the effective noise to take into account the randomness of observations. Recall that the marginal losses are "arbitrarily" chosen, and so we are not in a standard likelihood setting. Let $\boldsymbol{W}^* \in \mathcal{S}^m_{++}(\phi)$ denote the statistical truth, which is the learning target. Then we can show that there exists $\boldsymbol{C}^*$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{C}^* = \boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}^*; \boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}^*)$; see, Lemma D.2. Define

$$\boldsymbol{E} = -\frac{2}{n}\frac{\mathrm{d}(F - P)(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}; \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-))}{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{W}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{W}^-=\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}^-=\boldsymbol{C}^*}$$

as the noise. Hence in the noise-free scenario, the loss as a function of $\boldsymbol{W}$ must vanish at the statistical truth. In the Gaussian case, $\boldsymbol{E}$ becomes $\boldsymbol{W}^{*-1} - (\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{M})^T(\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{M})/n$.

Next, we choose a proper discrepancy measure to facilitate the analysis. For two positive-definite matrices $\boldsymbol{W}_1, \boldsymbol{W}_2$, the Bregman divergence associated with $-\log\det(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{W}_1, \boldsymbol{W}_2) = -\log\det(\boldsymbol{W}_1) + \log\det(\boldsymbol{W}_2) + \langle \boldsymbol{W}_2^{-1}, \boldsymbol{W}_1 - \boldsymbol{W}_2\rangle.$$

This divergence is always nonnegative since $-\log\det$ is strictly convex. We will use its symmetrized version

$$\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{W}_1, \boldsymbol{W}_2) = (\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{W}_1, \boldsymbol{W}_2) + \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{W}_2, \boldsymbol{W}_1))/2$$

to characterize the error. In the following theorem, we use $\|\boldsymbol{E}\|_{\max}$ to denote $\max_{j,k} |e_{j,k}|$. (As before, we assume $\phi$ is chosen sufficiently small, so that $\|\boldsymbol{W}^*\|_2 \leq \phi^{-1}$ and $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}\|_2 \leq \phi^{-1}$.) Define the support of $\boldsymbol{W}^*$ by $\mathcal{J}^* = \{(j, j') : w^*_{j,j'} \neq 0\}$ and $J^* = |\mathcal{J}^*|$.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Assume there exist large enough $K \geq 0, \vartheta > 0$ such that*

$$(1 + 1/\vartheta)\|(\boldsymbol{W} - \boldsymbol{W}^*)_{\mathcal{J}^*}\|_1 \leq \|(\boldsymbol{W} - \boldsymbol{W}^*)_{\mathcal{J}^{*c}}\|_1 + K\{J^*\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{W}^*)\}^{1/2} \tag{28}$$

*for any $\boldsymbol{W} \in \mathcal{S}^m_{++}(\phi)$. Then, on the event $\{\|\boldsymbol{E}\|_{\max} \leq \lambda_0\}$, with $\lambda = (2A + 2\vartheta + 1)\lambda_0$ for any $A \geq 0$, any fixed point $(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{C}}) \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfies*

$$\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}; \boldsymbol{W}^*) + Tr\{(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}} - \boldsymbol{W}^*)(\boldsymbol{S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{C}}) - \boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}^*)\} \leq (\vartheta + A)^2 K^2 \lambda_0^2 J^*, \tag{29}$$

*where $\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}) = (\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{C}^T\boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})^{-1/2}/n$.*

**Corollary 4.2.** *Assume $e_{j,k} \sim$ sub-exp$(c_1/n, c_2/n)$ for all $1 \leq j, k \leq m$ (cf. Definition D.1). Let $\lambda = c_1(2A + 2\vartheta + 1)\{(4 + 2\alpha)(\log m)/n\}^{1/2}$ with $A, \alpha \geq 0$. Then under (28) and $n \geq (c_2^2/c_1)(4 + 2\alpha)\log m$, (29) holds with probability $1 - 2m^{-\alpha}$ and the error bound on the right-hand side becomes $(4 + 2\alpha)c_1^2(\vartheta + A)^2K^2J^*(\log m)/n$.*

See Appendix D for the proof detail, from which the multiplicative constant preceding the Bregman term can be strengthened to any positive number less than 2. In the Gaussian case, the trace term in (29) disappears, and the rate matches that of Theorem 1 in Rothman et al. (2008) if $K$, $A$, $\vartheta$, $\alpha$, $c_1, c_2$ are treated as constants.

The regularity condition (28) is implied by

$$(1 + 1/\vartheta)^2\|(\boldsymbol{W} - \boldsymbol{W}^*)_{\mathcal{J}^*}\|_1^2 \leq K^2J^*\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{W}^*) \tag{30}$$

or

$$(1 + 1/\vartheta)^2\|(\boldsymbol{W} - \boldsymbol{W}^*)_{\mathcal{J}^*}\|_2^2 \leq K^2\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{W}^*) \tag{31}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{W} \in \mathcal{S}^m_{++}(\phi) : \|(\boldsymbol{W} - \boldsymbol{W}^*)_{\mathcal{J}^{*c}}\|_1 < (1 + 1/\vartheta)\|(\boldsymbol{W} - \boldsymbol{W}^*)_{\mathcal{J}^*}\|_1$. The conditions of (30) and (31) can be viewed as extensions of compatibility and restricted-eigenvalue assumptions (van de Geer and Bühlmann, 2009) in the graph setting.

# 5 Experiments

## 5.1 TDT2

The data is provided by Cai et al. (2005). It is a subset of the TDT2 corpus collected during the first half of 1998 from 6 sources: 2 newswires (APW, NYT), 2 radio programs (VOA, PRI) and 2 television programs (CNN, ABC). We picked 200 most frequently used words, and the document-term matrix records frequencies (counts) of each term in $n = 9394$ documents. We ran iGGL on the count data and used BIC for the tuning. A sparse association graph is plotted in Figure 1 using the R package GGally (Schloerke et al., 2016). Figure 2 shows only the connected nodes for a better view.

As seen in Figure 2, `president` makes a big hub and connects to `congress`, `policy`, `officials`, `washington`, and so on. Close to it is `clinton` which also exhibits rich connections to a variety of terms. It has direct association with `lewinsky` which is linked to `monica`, `story`, `told`, etc. On the left, we see many words around `iraq` and `un`, and these two words share some common neighbors like `weapons` and `deal`. In addition, interesting connections exist between `crisis`, `asia`, `financial`, and `market` in the lower part of the graph. These reflect some hot topics and key news events in the first half of 1998.

## 5.2 S&P 500

This dataset keeps a record of the closing prices of S&P 500 stocks from Jan. 1, 2003 to Jan. 1, 2008 (Zhao et al., 2012). It consists of 1258 samples for 487 stocks and has been preprocessed by taking logarithm and differencing transformations. We chose Tukey's robust loss in learning the association graph, due to potential outliers occurring in such financial data. It is well known that even in the transformed data, anomalies caused by extreme market movements may be present. Figure 3 demonstrates the topological structure after removing all isolated nodes.

The graph reveals some meaningful clusters and connections in the data collection period. On the left, we see three clusters of energy companies, e.g., `WEC`, `SCG`, `AEP`, oil related companies, e.g., `XOM`, `DO`, `BHI`, and semi-conductor companies, e.g., `INTC`, `ADI`, `TXN`. There is also a relatively small retailer group formed by `FDO`, `TGT`, `WMT`, and `HD` on the top. A number of financial companies (`JPM`, `BBT`, `AXP`, among many others) locate near the center and are densely




Figure 1: Poisson graph learning on TDT2.

connected. Interestingly, they connect to the estate cluster in the lower-right corner through PCL, i.e., Plum Creek Timber, which was the largest private owner of timberland in the U.S..

## 5.3 Newsgroup data

We use the recreation subset of the 20 newsgroups data including the newsgroups of *rec.autos*, *rec.motorcycles*, *rec.sport.baseball*, and *rec.sport.hockey*,[1]

[1]The 20 newsgroup dataset is available at `http://qwone.com/~jason/20Newsgroups/`.


trying
statement
times
according
question
ap
program
meet
allow
report
led
spokesman
air
attack
saturday
efforts
council
baghdad
mass
sites
inspectors
force
iraqi
action
gulf
weapons
war
nations
americans
region
saddam
team
husseen
prime
countries
japan
economy
asia
bank
financial
market
million
won
strong
look
headline
final
voa
theres
killed
home
city
lot
reporters
visit
sunday
saying
chief
deal
presidential
defense
including
administration
security
iraq
agreement
meeting
talks
tuesday
thursday
leader
washington
officials
news
monday
months
day
expected
minister
united
american
policy
week
saddam
foreign
crisis
economic
asian
international
indonesia
political
south
business
money
world
time
national
month
leaders
power
people
recent
country
spkr
help
reports
senior
told
official
lawsuit
clinton
president
house
monica
issue
right
material
bill
job
called
earlier
top
morning
late
situation
decision
close
weeks
left
hourpast
press
story
investigation
jury
court
federal
independent
matter
white
office
clintons
public
bills
own
days
life
live
congress
apro
believe
thats
im
lies
today
support
military
tonight
wednesday
including
tuesday
thursday
friday
monday
months
day
expected
american
policy
week
national
time
month
leaders
power
people
recent
country
spkr
help
reports
political
indonesia
business
money
south
international
economic
crisis
foreign
husseen
saddam
team
region
nations
americans
minister
united
weapons
war
gulf
iraqi
action
force
inspectors
sites
mass
baghdad
efforts
council
attack
saturday
spokesman
air
led
meet
allow
report
program
ap
deal
presidential
defense
including
administration
security
iraq
agreement
meeting
talks
tuesday
thursday
leader
washington
officials
news




Figure 3: Robust graph learning on S&P 500.

moved and we chose 150 words as the variables of interest. For mixed graph learning, these words were divided into three equal-sized subsets: the words in the first subset take TF-IDF values as the observed data, with Tukey as the loss type, the second subset makes use of word counts, and for the third subset, only the information of word occurrence (binary) is kept, and Lorenz is applied as the marginal losses. Figure 4 shows the topological structure

after removing all isolated points.

As seen in the graph, `team` locates near the center which indeed show up in many central topics in the threads of *rec.sport.baseball* and *rec.sport.hockey*. To the right it has connections to `winnipeg`, `maple`, `ranger`, `penguin`, relating to some famous teams in the National Hockey League (NHL), while its left neighbors `twin`, `yankee`, `baltimore`, and `pirate` refer to some Major League Baseball (MLB) teams. The graph also demonstrates interesting connections between the words that belong to *rec.autos* and *rec.motorcycles*. For example, `wheelie`, `steering`, `engine`, `auto`, `callison` on the left side of the figure are linked with the keyword `wheel`. The word `callison` represents James P. Callison, who appears to be an expert in performance tuning and is a big fan of car racing based on the conversations. At the bottom, `slow`, `mirror`, `avoid` reflect a major concern in auto and motorcycle sports discussions—driving safety.

# A Proof of Lemma 2.1

Let $f_1$ be the objective function in problem (7). We can evaluate the optimal $\boldsymbol{C}$ by letting $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{C}} f_1 = 0$:

$$-(\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{M} - \boldsymbol{C}(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2})(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2} + \phi(\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W} + \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}^T)/2 = 0.$$

Hence

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{C}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{C}}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, f_1 = (\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{M})(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}.$$




Figure 4: Mixed graph learning on newsgroups.

Plugging $\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}$ in $f_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1 =& \frac{1}{2\phi} Tr\{(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{I}+\phi\boldsymbol{W}))(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{I}+\phi\boldsymbol{W})^T(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})^T\} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} Tr\{(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}\boldsymbol{W}((\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2})^T(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})^T\} \\
&- \frac{n}{2}\log\det\boldsymbol{W} + P_M(\boldsymbol{M};\lambda_M) + P_W(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda_W) \\
=& \frac{\phi}{2} Tr\{(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})^T\} \\
&- \frac{1}{2} Tr\{(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})(\boldsymbol{W}-\phi\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{W}-\phi\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})^T\} \\
&- \frac{n}{2}\log\det\boldsymbol{W} + P_M(\boldsymbol{M};\lambda_M) + P_W(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda_W) \\
=& \frac{1}{2} Tr\{(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})^T\} - \frac{n}{2}\log\det\boldsymbol{W} + P_M(\boldsymbol{M};\lambda_M) + P_W(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda_W),
\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the objective function in (8). The conclusion follows if we set $\phi$ to be no more than $1/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}\|_2$ for any $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}$ as a solution to $\min_{\boldsymbol{M}\in\mathcal{X},\boldsymbol{W}\in\mathcal{S}^m_{++}} Tr\{(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{Y}-\boldsymbol{M})^T\}/2 - (n/2)\log\det(\boldsymbol{W}) + P_M(\boldsymbol{M};\lambda_M) + P_W(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda_W)$.

# B Proof of Lemma 2.2

Let $F$ be the objective function in the lemma. It is not difficult to calculate its gradients with respect to $\boldsymbol{C}$ and $\boldsymbol{W}$ (details omitted):

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\boldsymbol{C}} F =& \phi^{-1}\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta})(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2} + \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W} \\
\nabla_{\boldsymbol{W}} F =& -(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{-1/4}\frac{\boldsymbol{C}^T\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}) + \nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta})^T\boldsymbol{C}}{4}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{-1/4} + \frac{\boldsymbol{C}^T\boldsymbol{C}}{2} - \frac{n}{2}\boldsymbol{W}^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{Z} = \boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W}$. Then the optimal $\boldsymbol{C}$ must satisfy $\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}) = -\phi\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/2}$, which, when plugged into into $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{W}} F = \boldsymbol{0}$, yields

$$\frac{1}{4}[\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/4}\boldsymbol{C}^T\boldsymbol{C}(\phi\boldsymbol{W})\boldsymbol{Z}^{-3/4} + \boldsymbol{Z}^{-3/4}(\phi\boldsymbol{W})\boldsymbol{C}^T\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/4}] + \frac{\boldsymbol{C}^T\boldsymbol{C}}{2} - \frac{n}{2}\boldsymbol{W}^{-1} = \boldsymbol{0}.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\Xi} - \boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{4}[\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/4}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})^T(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})\phi\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/4} + \boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/4}\phi\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})^T(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/4}] \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})^T(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2} - \frac{n}{2}\boldsymbol{W}^{-1} = \boldsymbol{0}. \qquad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

Noticing that

$$(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}\boldsymbol{W}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{1/2}=\boldsymbol{W}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})=\boldsymbol{W}^{-1}-\phi\boldsymbol{I}, \tag{33}$$

it is easy to verify that $\boldsymbol{W}=[(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})^T(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})/n]^{-1}$ satisfies (32). Hence in the following, we study the equation group

$$\begin{cases}\phi^{-1}\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta})\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}+\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{0}\\ \boldsymbol{W}^{-1}=(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})^T(\boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M})/n\\ \boldsymbol{\Theta}=\boldsymbol{M}+\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}\\ \boldsymbol{\Xi}-\boldsymbol{M}=\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/2}\\ \boldsymbol{Z}=\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W}.\end{cases} \tag{34}$$

Recall the assumption that $\boldsymbol{M}=\boldsymbol{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T$ with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}=[\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_m]^T$ and $l_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k)=l_k(\theta_{1,k})+\cdots+l_k(\theta_{n,k})$. By definition,

$$\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta})=[\nabla l_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1),\ldots,\nabla l_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m)]=\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M})+\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{D}+\boldsymbol{\Delta},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ is short for $\boldsymbol{\Delta}(\boldsymbol{\Theta};\boldsymbol{M})$. The 1st equation in (34) becomes

$$(\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M})+\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{D}+\boldsymbol{\Delta})\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}+\phi\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{0}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/2}&=-(\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M})+\boldsymbol{\Delta})\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}+\phi\boldsymbol{W})^{-1}\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/2}\\ &=-(\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M})+\boldsymbol{\Delta})[\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{D}+\boldsymbol{Z}^{1/2}\phi\boldsymbol{W}\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1/2}]^{-1}\\ &=-(\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M})+\boldsymbol{\Delta})[(\boldsymbol{I}-\phi\boldsymbol{W})\boldsymbol{D}+\phi\boldsymbol{W}]^{-1}\\ &=-(\nabla\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{M})+\boldsymbol{\Delta})[\boldsymbol{D}+\phi\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{D})]^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality, similar to (33), can be verified by spectral decomposition. The conclusion follows from the 2nd and the 4th equations in (34).

# C Proof of Lemma 3.1

The proof is straightforward. For completeness, some details are given as follows. We denote the objective function and the surrogate function by $f(\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ and $g(\boldsymbol{\Theta};\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]})$, respectively, with a bit abuse of notation. From the construction of the surrogate function, we have

$$g(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k+1]};\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]})\leq g(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]};\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]})=f(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{[k]}). \tag{35}$$

It suffices to show $f(\boldsymbol{\Theta}) \leq g(\boldsymbol{\Theta}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}})$ for any $\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ and $\rho \geq L$, or

$$\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}) - \bar{l}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}) - \langle \nabla \bar{l}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}), \boldsymbol{\Theta} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \rangle - \frac{\rho}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\|_F^2 \leq 0. \tag{36}$$

It follows from the Lipschitz condition that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{l}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}) - \bar{l}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}) - \langle \nabla \bar{l}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}), \boldsymbol{\Theta} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \rangle \\
=& \int_0^1 \langle \nabla \bar{l}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} + t(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}})), \boldsymbol{\Theta} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \rangle \, \mathrm{d}t - \int_0^1 \langle \nabla \bar{l}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}), \boldsymbol{\Theta} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \rangle \, \mathrm{d}t \\
=& \int_0^1 \langle \nabla \bar{l}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} + t(\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}})) - \nabla \bar{l}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}), \boldsymbol{\Theta} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \rangle \, \mathrm{d}t \\
\leq& \int_0^1 \sum_{i,j} Lt |\theta_{ij} - \tilde{\theta}_{ij}|^2 \, \mathrm{d}t \\
\leq& \frac{L}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\Theta} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\|_F^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion thus follows.

# D Proof of Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.2

**Lemma D.1.** *The following basic facts hold*

*(i)* $g(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}; \boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}) = F(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C})$;

*(ii)* $\frac{\partial g(\boldsymbol{W}^+, \boldsymbol{C}^+; \boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{C}^+}|_{\boldsymbol{W}^+ = \boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}^+ = \boldsymbol{C}} = \frac{\partial F(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{C}}$;

*(iii)* $\frac{\partial (g-P)(\boldsymbol{W}^+, \boldsymbol{C}^+; \boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{W}^+}|_{\boldsymbol{W}^+ = \boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}^+ = \boldsymbol{C}} = \frac{\partial (F-P)(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{W}}$;

*(iv)* $\frac{\partial g(\boldsymbol{W}^+, \boldsymbol{C}^+; \boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}}{\partial \boldsymbol{C}^+}|_{\boldsymbol{C}^+ = \boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}^+; \boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C})} = \boldsymbol{0}$;

*(v)* $\frac{\mathrm{d}(g-P)(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}; \boldsymbol{C}^-, \boldsymbol{W}^-); \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-)}{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{W}} = (n/2)(\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}; \boldsymbol{C}^-, \boldsymbol{W}^-)) - \boldsymbol{W}^{-1})$, *where* $\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}) = (\boldsymbol{I} - \phi \boldsymbol{W})^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{C}^T \boldsymbol{C} (\boldsymbol{I} - \phi \boldsymbol{W})^{-1/2} / n$.

These properties are easy to verify from the construction of $g$, and the proofs are omitted.

Recall that $\boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}; \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-) = \mathrm{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{C}} \, g(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}; \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-)$, where we omit its dependence on data matrix $\boldsymbol{Y}$. To guarantee that $\boldsymbol{E}$ is well defined we need the following lemma.

**Lemma D.2.** *Given any feasible $\boldsymbol{W}^* \in \mathcal{S}_{++}^m$, there exists $\boldsymbol{C}^*$ such that $\boldsymbol{C}^* = \boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}^*; \boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}^*)$.*

To prove the result, define a sequence of iterates

$$\boldsymbol{C}^{k+1} = \boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}^*; \boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}^k) = \min_{\boldsymbol{C}} g(\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}; \boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}^k).$$

Let $f(\boldsymbol{C}) = F(\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C})$ and $h(\boldsymbol{C}, \boldsymbol{C}^-) = g(\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}; \boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}^-)$. Define $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\bar{l}}(\boldsymbol{C}, \boldsymbol{C}') = \bar{l}(\boldsymbol{C}) - \bar{l}(\boldsymbol{C}') - \langle \nabla \bar{l}(\boldsymbol{C}'), \boldsymbol{C} - \boldsymbol{C}' \rangle$ and $\mathbf{D}_2(\boldsymbol{C}, \boldsymbol{C}') = \|\boldsymbol{C} - \boldsymbol{C}'\|_F^2/2$. Then it is easy to see that

$$f(\boldsymbol{C}^{k+1}) + (\frac{1}{\phi}\mathbf{D}_2 - \frac{1}{\phi}\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\bar{l}})(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}^k) = h(\boldsymbol{C}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{C}^k). \tag{37}$$

Moreover, from the optimality of $\boldsymbol{C}^{k+1}$, we have

$$h(\boldsymbol{C}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{C}^k) + \frac{1}{2\phi}\|\boldsymbol{C}^k - \boldsymbol{C}^{k+1}\|^2_{(\boldsymbol{I} - \phi \boldsymbol{W}^*)^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{C}^k - \boldsymbol{C}^{k+1}\|^2_{(\boldsymbol{W}^*)^{1/2}} \le h(\boldsymbol{C}^k, \boldsymbol{C}^k)$$

or

$$h(\boldsymbol{C}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{C}^k) + \frac{1}{2\phi}\|\boldsymbol{C}^k - \boldsymbol{C}^{k+1}\|_F^2 \le f(\boldsymbol{C}^k). \tag{38}$$

Combining (37) and (38) gives

$$\frac{1}{\phi}(2\mathbf{D}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\bar{l}})(\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k, \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k+1}) \le f(\boldsymbol{C}^k) - f(\boldsymbol{C}^{k+1}).$$

It follows from the Lipschitz condition that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Theta}^k - \boldsymbol{\Theta}^{k+1}\|_F^2 \le 2\phi(f(\boldsymbol{C}^k) - f(\boldsymbol{C}^{k+1})) \tag{39}$$

and so the sequence of $f(\boldsymbol{C}^k)$ is monotonically non-increasing. This implies that (i) $\boldsymbol{C}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{C}^k \to \mathbf{0}$, and (ii) $Tr\{\boldsymbol{C}^k \boldsymbol{W}^* \boldsymbol{C}^k\}$ and thus $\boldsymbol{C}^k$ are uniformly bounded. Therefore, any limit point of $\{\boldsymbol{C}^k\}$ can serve as $\boldsymbol{C}^*$ which also depends on $\boldsymbol{Y}$.

From Lemma D.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathrm{d}(F - P)(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}; \boldsymbol{W}^-, \boldsymbol{C}^-))}{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{W}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{W}^-=\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}^-=\boldsymbol{C}^*} \\
=&\frac{\partial F(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{C}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{C}^*} \frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W}; \boldsymbol{C}^-, \boldsymbol{W}^-)}{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{W}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{W}^-=\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}^-=\boldsymbol{C}^*} \\
&+ \frac{\partial (F - P)(\boldsymbol{W}, \boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{W}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*, \boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{C}^*}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term,

$$\frac{\partial F(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{C}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{C}^*} \overset{(ii)}{=} \frac{\partial g(\boldsymbol{W}^+,\boldsymbol{C}^+;\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{C}^+}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}^+=\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}^+=\boldsymbol{C}^*,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{C}^*} \overset{(iv)}{=} \mathbf{0}.$$

For the second term,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial (F-P)(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{W}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{C}^*} \\
\overset{(iii)}{=}&\frac{\partial (g-P)(\boldsymbol{W}^+,\boldsymbol{C}^+;\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})}{\partial \boldsymbol{W}^+}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}^+=\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}^+=\boldsymbol{C}^*,\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{C}^*} \\
=&\frac{\mathrm{d}(g-P)(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W};\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-);\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-)}{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{W}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}^-=\boldsymbol{C}^*,\boldsymbol{W}^-=\boldsymbol{W}^*} \\
\overset{(v)}{=}&(n/2)(\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}^*)-\boldsymbol{W}^{*-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is due to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathrm{d}(g-P)(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W};\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-);\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-)}{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{W}} \\
=&\frac{\partial (g-P)(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C};\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-)}{\partial \boldsymbol{C}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W};\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-)}\frac{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W};\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-)}{\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{W}} \\
&+\frac{\partial (g-P)(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C};\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-)}{\partial \boldsymbol{W}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W};\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-)} \\
\overset{(iv)}{=}&\frac{\partial (g-P)(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C};\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-)}{\partial \boldsymbol{W}}\Big|_{\boldsymbol{C}=\boldsymbol{C}^\star(\boldsymbol{W};\boldsymbol{W}^-,\boldsymbol{C}^-)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $\boldsymbol{E}=\boldsymbol{W}^{*-1}-\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}^*)$.

Given any fixed point $(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\hat{\boldsymbol{C}})$ under the algorithm mapping, we have $g(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\hat{\boldsymbol{C}};\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}) \le g(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C};\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}), \forall(\boldsymbol{W},\boldsymbol{C})\in\mathcal{Z}$. Taking $\boldsymbol{C}=\hat{\boldsymbol{C}}$, we know from Lemma 2.1 that $\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}$ is the global minimizer of the following problem

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{W}\in\mathcal{S}^m_{++}} \frac{n}{2}Tr\{\boldsymbol{S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\hat{\boldsymbol{C}})\boldsymbol{W}\} - \frac{n}{2}\log\det(\boldsymbol{W}) + P(\boldsymbol{W};\lambda).$$

For short write $\hat{\boldsymbol{S}}$ for $\boldsymbol{S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\hat{\boldsymbol{C}})$. Since the loss and the penalty are convex, it is not difficult to show

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{n}{2}Tr\{\hat{\boldsymbol{S}}\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}\} - \frac{n}{2}\log\det(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}) + P(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}) + \frac{n}{2}\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{W};\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}) \\
\le&\frac{n}{2}Tr\{\hat{\boldsymbol{S}}\boldsymbol{W}\} - \frac{n}{2}\log\det(\boldsymbol{W}) + P(\boldsymbol{W}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{D}$ is the Bregman divergence associated with $-\log\det$. Then

$$\frac{n}{2}Tr\{\hat{\boldsymbol{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W})\}+\frac{n}{2}\mathbf{D}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\boldsymbol{W})+\frac{n}{2}\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{W},\hat{\boldsymbol{W}})$$
$$+\frac{n}{2}\langle-\boldsymbol{W}^{-1},\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}\rangle\leq P(\boldsymbol{W})-P(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}),$$

and setting $\boldsymbol{W}=\boldsymbol{W}^*$ yields

$$n\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\boldsymbol{W}^*)+\frac{n}{2}Tr\{\hat{\boldsymbol{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}^*)\}+\frac{n}{2}\langle-\boldsymbol{W}^{*-1},\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}^*\rangle$$
$$\leq P(\boldsymbol{W}^*)-P(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}).$$

Denote $\boldsymbol{S}(\boldsymbol{W}^*,\boldsymbol{C}^*)$ by $\boldsymbol{S}^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&n\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}};\boldsymbol{W}^*)+\frac{n}{2}Tr\{(\hat{\boldsymbol{S}}-\boldsymbol{S}^*)(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}^*)\}\\&\leq P(\boldsymbol{W}^*)-P(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}})+\frac{n}{2}\langle\boldsymbol{W}^{*-1}-\boldsymbol{S}^*,\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}^*\rangle\\&=P(\boldsymbol{W}^*)-P(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}})+\frac{n}{2}\langle\boldsymbol{E},\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}^*\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

Under $\|\boldsymbol{E}\|_{\max}\leq\lambda_0$, (40) is bounded by $(n/2)(\lambda\|\boldsymbol{W}^*\|_1-\lambda\|\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}\|_1+\lambda_0\|\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}^*\|_1)$. It follows from the definition of $\mathcal{J}^*$ and the sub-additivity of the $\ell_1$-norm that

$$\begin{aligned}&2\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}};\boldsymbol{W}^*)+Tr\{(\hat{\boldsymbol{S}}-\boldsymbol{S}^*)(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}^*)\}\\&\leq(\lambda+\lambda_0)\|(\boldsymbol{W}^*-\hat{\boldsymbol{W}})_{\mathcal{J}^*}\|_1-(\lambda-\lambda_0)\|(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}^*)_{\mathcal{J}^{*c}}\|_1\\&=\lambda_0(2A+2\vartheta+2)\|(\boldsymbol{W}^*-\hat{\boldsymbol{W}})_{\mathcal{J}^*}\|_1-\lambda_0(2A+2\vartheta)\|(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W}^*)_{\mathcal{J}^{*c}}\|_1,\end{aligned}$$

where we set $\lambda=(2A+1+2\vartheta)\lambda_0$ with $A\geq0$. Using the regularity condition and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&2\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}};\boldsymbol{W}^*)+Tr\{(\hat{\boldsymbol{S}}-\boldsymbol{S}^*)(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}}-\boldsymbol{W})\}\\&\leq\lambda_0 2(A+\vartheta)K(J^*\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\boldsymbol{W}^*))^{1/2}\\&\leq\frac{2(\vartheta+A)^2K^2\lambda_0^2J^*}{a}+\frac{a}{2}\mathbf{D}^{(s)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{W}},\boldsymbol{W}^*)\end{aligned}$$

for any $a>0$. Taking $a=2$ gives the desired result.

To prove Corollary 4.2, we first define sub-exponential random variables:

**Definition D.1.** *$X$ is is sub-exponential with mean 0 and parameters $(\nu, b)$, i.e., $X \sim$ sub-exp$(\nu, b)$, if and only if there exist $\nu, b \geq 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda X)] \leq \exp(\nu\lambda^2/2)$ for all $|\lambda| \leq 1/b$.*

A basic property of $X \sim \text{sub-exp}(\nu, b)$ is that $\mathbb{P}[|X| \geq t] \leq 2\exp(-t^2/(2\nu))$ for any $t : 0 \leq t \leq \nu/b$ which is easy to show based on the definition.

Therefore, under $e_{j,k} \sim \text{sub-exp}(c_1/n, c_2/n)$, $\forall j, k : 1 \leq j, k \leq m$

$$\mathbb{P}(\max|e_{j,k}| \geq t) \leq 2\exp(-\frac{nt^2}{2c_1} + 2\log m), \forall t : 0 \leq t \leq \frac{c_1}{c_2}$$

Let $t = \lambda_0 = A_0\sqrt{(\log m)/n}$ with $A_0 : A_0^2 = c_1(4 + 2\alpha)$. Then the above probability bound is $2m^{-\alpha}$ as long as $A_0\sqrt{(\log m)/n} \leq c_1/c_2$ or $n \geq (4 + 2\alpha)(c_2^2/c_1)\log m$.

# References


Galen Andrew and Jianfeng Gao. Scalable training of $\ell_1$-regularized log-linear models. In *Proceedings of the 24$^{th}$ international conference on Machine learning*, pages 33–40. ACM, 2007.

Onureena Banerjee, Laurent El Ghaoui, and Alexandre d'Aspremont. Model selection through sparse maximum likelihood estimation for multivariate gaussian or binary data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9:485–516, 2008.

A. Barbu, Y. She, L. Ding, and G. Gramajo. Feature selection with annealing for computer vision and big data learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, PP(99):1–1, 2016.

Julian Besag. Statistical analysis of non-lattice data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series D (The Statistician)*, 24(3):179–195, 1975.

Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. *Natural Language Processing with Python*. O'Reilly Media, Boston, 1st edition, 2009.

Deng Cai, Xiaofei He, and Jiawei Han. Document clustering using locality preserving indexing. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 17(12):1624–1637, 2005.

Adrian Dobra and Alex Lenkoski. Copula gaussian graphical models and their application to modeling functional disability data. *Ann. Appl. Stat.*, 5(2A):969–993, 06 2011.

Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. *Biostatistics*, 9(3):432–441, 2008.

Frank R. Hampel, Elvezio M. Ronchetti, Peter J. Rousseeuw, and Werner A. Stahel. *Robust statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2005.

Holger Höfling and Robert Tibshirani. Estimation of sparse binary pairwise markov networks using pseudo-likelihoods. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10:883–906, 2009.

Cho-Jui Hsieh, Matyas A Sustik, Inderjit S Dhillon, Pradeep K Ravikumar, and Russell Poldrack. BIG & QUIC: Sparse inverse covariance estimation for a million variables. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 3165–3173. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.

Peter J. Huber and Elvezio M. Ronchetti. *Robust statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, Second edition, 2009.

Ernst Ising. Beitrag zur theorie des ferromagnetismus. *Zeitschrift für Physik A Hadrons and Nuclei*, 31(1):253–258, 1925.

Dimitris Karlis. An EM algorithm for multivariate Poisson distribution and related models. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 30(1):63–77, 2003.

Steffen L. Lauritzen. *Graphical models*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1996.

Jason D. Lee and Trevor J. Hastie. Learning the structure of mixed graphical models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 24(1):230–253, 2015.

Han Liu, John Lafferty, and Larry Wasserman. The nonparanormal: Semiparametric estimation of high dimensional undirected graphs. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10:2295–2328, 2009.

Han Liu, Fang Han, Ming Yuan, John Lafferty, and Larry Wasserman. High-dimensional semiparametric gaussian copula graphical models. *Ann. Statist.*, 40(4):2293–2326, 08 2012.

David Madigan, Jeremy York, and Denis Allard. Bayesian graphical models for discrete data. *International Statistical Review*, pages 215–232, 1995.

Rahul Mazumder and Trevor Hastie. Exact covariance thresholding into connected components for large-scale graphical lasso. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):781–794, 2012.

Nicolai Meinshausen and Peter Bühlmann. High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the lasso. *Ann. Statist.*, 34(3):1436–1462, 06 2006.

Figen Oztoprak, Jorge Nocedal, Steven Rennie, and Peder A Olsen. Newton-like methods for sparse inverse covariance estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 755–763, 2012.

Pradeep Ravikumar, Martin J. Wainwright, and John D. Lafferty. High-dimensional Ising model selection using $\ell_1$-regularized logistic regression. *Ann. Statist.*, 38(3):1287–1319, 06 2010.

Saharon Rosset and Ji Zhu. Piecewise linear regularized solution paths. *Ann. Statist.*, 35(3):1012–1030, 07 2007.

Adam J. Rothman, Peter J. Bickel, Elizaveta Levina, and Ji Zhu. Sparse permutation invariant covariance estimation. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 2:494–515, 2008.

Barret Schloerke, Jason Crowley, Di Cook, Francois Briatte, Moritz Marbach, Edwin Thoen, and Amos Elberg. *GGally: Extension to ggplot2*, 2016. URL `http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=GGally`. R package version 1.0.1.

Mark Schmidt. *Graphical model structure learning with $\ell_1$-regularization.* PhD thesis, The University of British Columbia, 2010.

Eran Treister and Javier S Turek. A block-coordinate descent approach for large-scale sparse inverse covariance estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27*, pages 927–935. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014.

Sara A. van de Geer and Peter Bühlmann. On the conditions used to prove oracle results for the lasso. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 3:1360–1392, 2009.

Daniela M Witten, Jerome H Friedman, and Noah Simon. New insights and faster computations for the graphical lasso. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 20(4):892–900, 2011.

Lingzhou Xue and Hui Zou. Regularized rank-based estimation of high-dimensional nonparanormal graphical models. *Ann. Statist.*, 40(5):2541–2571, 10 2012.

Lingzhou Xue, Hui Zou, and Tianxi Cai. Nonconcave penalized composite conditional likelihood estimation of sparse Ising models. *Ann. Statist.*, 40 (3):1403–1429, 06 2012.

Eunho Yang, Genevera Allen, Zhandong Liu, and Pradeep K Ravikumar. Graphical models via generalized linear models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1358–1366, 2012.

Eunho Yang, Pradeep K Ravikumar, Genevera I Allen, and Zhandong Liu. On Poisson graphical models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1718–1726, 2013.

Eunho Yang, Yulia Baker, Pradeep D Ravikumar, Genevera I Allen, and Zhandong Liu. Mixed graphical models via exponential families. In *AISTATS*, pages 1042–1050, 2014.

Eunho Yang, Pradeep Ravikumar, Genevera I. Allen, and Zhandong Liu. Graphical models via univariate exponential family distributions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):3813–3847, January 2015.

Ming Yuan and Yi Lin. Model selection and estimation in the Gaussian graphical model. *Biometrika*, 94(1):19–35, 2007.

Tuo Zhao, Han Liu, Kathryn Roeder, John Lafferty, and Larry Wasserman. The huge package for high-dimensional undirected graph estimation in R. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(12):1059–1062, 2012.